



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,574	02/01/2001	Arndt Jentzsch		2513
7590	03/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Douglas R. Hanscom JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C. P.O. Box 2266, Eads Station Arlington, VA 22202			EVANS HENCE, ANDREA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/774,574	JENTZSCH, ARNDT	
	Examiner Andrea H. Evans	Art Unit 2854	<i>pw</i>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,5,7 and 9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3,5,7 and 9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION-FINAL REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,3, and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smiggen (4116715) in view of Muth (5623877) and in view of Naniwa et al (6112664).

Referring to claim 1, Smiggen teaches a method of producing multicolor printing using printing plates including providing a printing plate neutralizing device useable to remove images and print from used printing plates (See Column 1, lines 36-39); neutralizing said used printing plates in said printing plate neutralizing device by removing used images and print from said used printing plates; (See Column 1, lines 36-39); applying a coating to said neutralized printing plates (See Column 1, line 47); providing a printing plate exposure and development unit (See Column 1, line 48); providing new images and print to said neutralized and coated printing plates in said exposure and development unit and developing said new images (See Column 3, lines 18-19).

Smiggen does not explicitly teach providing a printing forme cylinder adapted for receiving printing plates and removing printing plates used in a previous printing task for said printing forme cylinder. Muth teaches providing a printing forme cylinder adapted for receiving printing plates and removing printing plates used in a previous printing task for said printing forme cylinder (See Column 1, lines 22-29). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smiggen such that a printing forme cylinder adapted for receiving printing plates is provided and the printing plates used in a previous printing task for said printing forme cylinder are removed to avoid having the printing press stand idle for a long period of time as taught by Muth.

Smiggen does not explicitly teach locating said printing plate neutralizing device separate from said printing forme cylinder. It is Examiner's position that the neutralizing device of Smiggen must be separate since it is inherent that the plate would be removed from the cylinder before immersing it into boiling water since one of ordinary skill in the art would remove the plate in order to not damage the cylinder. However, Muth teaches the desirability of preparing the plate off-press in order to have it prepared quickly so that the printing press will not have to stand idle for a long period of time.

Smiggen teaches that the printing plate may be reused (See Column 3, lines 18-19). Smiggen does not explicitly teach returning said neutralized and coated printing plates provided with said new images and print to said printing forme cylinder; and reapplying said neutralized and coated printing plates with said new images and print to said forme cylinder. Muth teaches that printing plates frequently have to be changed and Muth teaches having a prepared printing plate situated adjacent to the plate cylinder. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smiggen such that the neutralized and coated printing plate is reapplied with new images to avoid having the printing press stand idle for a long period of time as taught by Muth.

Smiggen and Muth do not explicitly teach securing the neutralized and coated printing plates in proper registration in the exposure and development unit. Naniwa teaches proper

registration of printing plates in the exposure and development unit (See Column 3, lines 36-41).

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smiggen's registration unit such that the plates are in proper alignment so that the exposure and development can be executed efficiently as taught by Naniwa.

Referring to claims 3 and 9, Smiggen and Muth do not explicitly teach providing a registration system/unit. Naniwa teaches registration system/unit (See Figure 4). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a registration system/registration unit as claimed since one would always need to maintain proper registration when securing printing plates as taught by Naniwa.

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smiggen (4116715) in view of Muth (5623877) in view of Naniwa et al (6112664) and further in view of Detmers et al (6510795).

Referring to claim 5, Smiggen, Muth and Naniwa teach all that is claimed as discussed in the above rejection except an automatic plate changing device. Detmers teaches an automatic plate changing device (24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Smiggen by including an automatic plate changing device therein, in order to provide an automated transferring means as taught by Detmers.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smiggen (4116715) in view of Muth (5623877) in view of Naniwa et al (6112664) and further in view of Love (4718340).

Referring to claim 7, Smiggen, Muth and Naniwa teach all that is claimed as discussed in the above rejection except using a laser neutralization technique. Love teaches neutralizing said

used printing plates using a laser neutralization technique. (See Column 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Smiggen such that its neutralization technique is a laser to adequately neutralize the plate as taught by Love.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3,5,7 and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea H. Evans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2162. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea H. Evans

AHE



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800